

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	Criminal No. 2:16-CR-083-D(1)
	§	
MOISES JIMENEZ,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

ORDER


Defendant's September 1, 2017 *pro se* motion for a new trial and to appoint an attorney and paralegal for new trial and appeal is denied.

Defendant is represented in this case by retained counsel. He does not have a right to hybrid representation, in which his counsel files some motions and he files others. *See, e.g., United States v. Hardeman*, 48 Fed. Appx. 918, 2002 WL 31115183, at **1 (5th Cir. Sept. 19, 2002) (per curiam) (unpublished opinion) ("[Defendant] was represented by counsel in the district court, and he had no right to hybrid representation." (citing *United States v. Daniels*, 572 F.2d 535, 540 (5th Cir.1978))). Accordingly, this court is not required to accept his *pro se* motions. *See id.* ("The district court need not have accepted [defendant's] *pro se* motions.").

His motion is therefore denied.

SO ORDERED.

September 1, 2017.


SIDNEY A. FITZWATER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE